REMARKS

The specification and claims have been carefully reviewed in light of the action by the Examiner. Claims 2,5,11, and 13 are left in the application. Claim 2 has been amended in accordance with the Examiners suggestion. Claim 5 has been amended in accordance with the Examiners suggestion. Claim 11 has been amended in accordance with the Examiners suggestion. Claim 12 has been cancelled and rewritten as claim 13 in accordance ith the Examiners suggestion. No new matter has been added. Before taking up the claims in detail attention will be given to the references cited by the Examiner. The European Patent Application Ser No. EP 0724305A1 calls for a fire retardant gel electrolyte which has a gelled electrolyte composed of a non-aqueous solvent and a salt of an electrolyte dissolved in the non-aqueous solvent, the gel electrolyte having an ionic conductivity of 1 mS/cm at a temperature of 25° C. The present application does not use a gelled electrolyte, which is the only electrolyte mentioned in the cited European Application. Nor does it suggest the use of any other electrolyte other than a gelled one. The US Patent to Yde-Andersen et al calls for an eletrolyte consisting essentially of a salt mixture and a solvent mixture. The salt mixture includes lithium hexafluorophosphate. This is not found in the present applicants electrolyte. This mixture of Yde-Andersen is a mixture of EC and DMC, not PC or GBL like that of Applicant. The mixtures of Yde-Andersen is not fire resistant, and does not have the specific combinations of

Applicant. There is not even a remote suggestion that the electrolyte of Yde-Andersen can be substituted for that of Akashi. Claim 2 of Applicant calls for a fire resistant stable electrolyte which comprises $LiBF_4$ in the range of 1.5 to 3 molar concentration in a solvent mixture of Ethylene carbonate in the range of 70 to 90% mixture by weight percentage, and propylene carbonate in the range of 10 to 30% by weight percentage. This fire resistant mixture is just not found in the references alone or in combination. The remaining claims also find no response in the references.

Accordingly it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance, and such action is requested and urged.

Respectfully submitted,

Zachary T. Wobensmith, III

Attorney for Applicants

Reg. No. 26,524

7746 101st Court

Vero Beach, FL 32967-2871

772-589-2073